

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF ARKANSAS  
FAYETTEVILLE DIVISION

JILL DILLARD, JESSA SEEWALD,  
JINGER VUOLO, and JOY DUGGAR,

Plaintiff,

Case No.: 5:17-CV-05089-TLB

CITY OF SPRINGDALE; WASHINGTON  
COUNTY; KATHY O'KELLEY; ERNEST  
CATE; RICK HOYT; STEVE ZEGA;  
BAUER PUBLISHING COMPANY, L.P.;  
BAUER MAGAZINE, L.P.; BAUER MEDIA  
GROUP, INC.; BAUER, INC.; HEINRICH  
BAUER NORTH AMERICA, INC.; BAUER  
MEDIA GROUP USA, LLC; and DOES 1-10,  
inclusive,

Defendant.

---

**PLAINTIFFS' MOTION *IN LIMINE* NO. 8 TO EXCLUDE REFERENCE TO  
WHETHER PLAINTIFFS HAVE FORGIVEN JOSH DUGGAR AND WHY THEY  
HAVE NOT SUED JOSH DUGGAR**

**I. INTRODUCTION AND FACTUAL BACKGROUND**

Plaintiffs are four sisters who suffered sexual abuse at the hands of their brother, Josh Duggar, when they were minor children in or around 2002. This litigation arose from Defendants' improper release of confidential official reports documenting the details of Plaintiffs' sexual molestations, which occurred in May 2015. Plaintiffs' claims at trial include: (1) Invasion of Privacy – Public Disclosure of Private Fact; (2) Invasion of Privacy – Intrusion Upon Seclusion; and (3) Tort of Outrage.

At Plaintiffs' depositions, counsel for Defendants asked questions about whether they have forgiven Josh Duggar and why they have not sued him. (*See, e.g.*, Ex. A to Declaration of Steven E. Bledsoe ("Bledsoe Decl.") [Dep. Tr. of Jill Dillard] at 201:13-16; Ex. B to Bledsoe Decl. [Dep. Tr. of Jessa Seewald] at 64:20-65:14; Ex. D to Bledsoe Decl. [Dep. Tr. of Joy Forsyth] at 47:25-48:10, 46:13-48:11.) Putting aside that both of these lines of inquiry are irrelevant and violate Rule 403, because this evidence is plainly inadmissible, Plaintiffs' motion should be granted.

**II. ARGUMENT**

Evidence relating to whether Plaintiffs have forgiven Josh and why they have not sued him is irrelevant and violates Rule 403.

***Relevance.*** Rule 402 of the Federal Rules of Evidence provides that "[e]vidence which is not relevant is not admissible." And evidence is only relevant if it has a tendency to make the existence of any fact that is of consequence to the determination of the action more or less probable than it would be without the evidence. *See* Fed. R. Evid. 401. This case is about whether Defendants committed various torts by releasing the reports containing details of sexual abuse of minors in violation of the law. Evidence relating to whether Plaintiffs have forgiven

their abuser and why they have not sued him has zero to do with whether *Defendants'* disclosure of confidential reports makes them liable for invasion of privacy and the tort of outrage.

Because this evidence is irrelevant, it is inadmissible. *See Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402.*

**Rule 403.** And even if evidence about whether Plaintiffs have forgiven Josh Duggar and why they have not sued him was relevant (it is not), this evidence should still be excluded because it violates Rule 403 of the Federal Rules of Evidence. Rule 403 allows courts to exclude otherwise relevant evidence if its probative value would be substantially outweighed by the danger of unfair prejudice, confusing the issues, misleading the jury, undue delay, waste of time, or needless presentation of cumulative evidence. This Court has “great deference” to balance the relative value of evidence against its prejudicial effect. *See United States v. Lupino*, 301 F.3d 642, 646 (8th Cir. 2002).

Here, evidence relating to whether Plaintiffs have forgiven Josh and why they have not sued him has no probative value whatsoever. Even worse, this evidence would only waste the jury’s time and mislead the jury by confusing the relevant issues. This trial is about Defendants’ intentional torts, and nothing else. Defendants’ cynical attempt to divert the jury’s attention should fail.

### **III. CONCLUSION**

For the reasons stated herein, Plaintiffs respectfully request that the Court grant this motion and exclude all evidence at trial relating to whether Plaintiffs have forgiven Josh Duggar and why they have not sued him.

Respectfully submitted,

By: /s/ Steven E. Bledsoe

---

Stephen G. Larson (admitted *pro hac vice*)

*slarson@larsonllp.com*

Steven E. Bledsoe (admitted *pro hac vice*)

*sbleedsoe@larsonllp.com*

Jen C. Won (admitted *pro hac vice*)

*jwon@larsonllp.com*

**LARSON LLP**

555 South Flower Street, Suite 4400

Los Angeles, California 90071

Telephone: (213) 436-4888

Facsimile: (213) 623-2000

Shawn B. Daniels (Ark. Bar No. 99126)

*shawn@danielsfirm.com*

**DANIELS FIRM**

129 W. Sunbridge Drive

Fayetteville, AR 72703

Telephone: (479) 521-7000

Facsimile: (479) 437-2007

Attorneys for Plaintiffs JILL DILLARD, JESSA

SEEWALD, JINGER VUOLO, and JOY

FORSYTH